

Process for Validating Common Tasks Scores

Rhode Island Skills Commission

Explanation and Considerations for Use

The Rhode Island Skills Commission and its network schools developed this document. It represents one approach; you may choose to adopt it or may prefer to explore other approaches.

It is used to validate CIM or common tasks that have been scored twice at the district or school level, but need a validation to serve as CIM or anchor task entries in a student's portfolio and for departmental end-of-course exams.

This tool was created and/or compiled by The Rhode Island Department of Education and The Education Alliance at Brown University, with the generous support of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

<http://www.ride.ri.gov/highschoolreform/dslat/>
October, 2005



SAMPLE VALIDATION RECORDING SHEET FOR *REFLECTIVE ESSAY*

TASK NUMBER: _____ **VALIDATION SCORE:** _____ **SCORER'S INITIALS:** _____

Expectations	Exceeds standard 4	Meets standard 3	Comments
<p>*</p> <p>Engages the reader by establishing a context and analyzing a situation</p>	<p>Effectively identifies a condition, a situation, or an issue that addresses the prompt.</p> <p>Insightful analysis conveys significance of the condition, situation, or issue.</p>	<p>Clearly identifies a condition, a situation, or an issue that addresses the prompt.</p> <p>Analysis conveys significance of the condition, situation, or issue.</p>	
<p>*</p> <p>Uses a range of writing strategies</p>	<p>Skillfully selects and uses a range of writing strategies such as comparing and contrasting, using concrete details, description, creating a scenario.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Masterfully uses a more limited range of writing strategies.</p>	<p>Accurately selects and uses a range of writing strategies such as comparing and contrasting, using concrete details, description, creating a scenario.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Accurately and effectively uses a more limited range of writing strategies.</p>	
<p>Creates an organizing structure</p>	<p>The response is skillfully organized from beginning to end; this organization can be, but is not necessarily, sequential. This includes an opening, body, and closure that are complex.</p>	<p>The response is clearly organized from beginning to end; this organization can be, but is not necessarily, sequential. This includes an opening, body, and closure.</p>	
<p>Demonstrates understanding of English language conventions</p>	<p>Demonstrates consistent control of grammar, usage, punctuation, sentence construction, and spelling.</p>	<p>Demonstrates control of usage, grammar, punctuation, sentence construction, and spelling.</p>	

Portfolio Toolkit | Assess Entries | Calibration Of Rubrics

Expectations	Exceeds standard 4	Meets standard 3	Comments
<p align="center">*</p> <p>Engages the reader by establishing a context and analyzing a situation</p>	<p>Effectively identifies a condition, a situation, or an issue that addresses the prompt.</p> <p>Insightful analysis conveys significance of the condition, situation, or issue.</p>	<p>Clearly identifies a condition, a situation, or an issue that addresses the prompt.</p> <p>Analysis conveys significance of the condition, situation, or issue.</p>	
		<p>Occasional errors do not usually interfere with meaning.</p>	

Validation Process For Assessing Common Task Scores

For on-demand tasks:

Procedure:

Step One:

One specialist performs the following:

- ☐ Briefly review the task requirements
- ☐ Read on-standard rubric (enlarge 3 & 4 column, bulleted) to be used as a mental checklist
- ☐ Read student work sample
- ☐ Score holistically
- ☐ If the score agrees with the score on the front of the task, the task is validated.
- ☐ Insert the validation sheet inside the task and return to school

Step Two:

- ☐ When there is a discrepant score, the first reader completes the feedback sheet explaining reasons for discrepancy
- ☐ A second reader then scores the work in question and completes an additional feedback sheet explaining reasons
- ☐ If the two readers determine that the original score is invalid, scorers change score on task and on school task list. This task list is recorded at Skills level. A copy of the task list is also returned to the school.
- ☐ The task is returned to the student with feedback from the two scorers.
- ☐ If the second reader does not find a discrepancy, readers 1 and 2 conference to agree on a score.
- ☐ If agreement is not reached, a third scorer adjudicates and determines the final score. After adjudication, the discrepant sheet is removed and not returned to student. Same process as above is followed for recording and returning tasks.
- ☐ If frequent discrepancies exist in scoring, these will be pointed out to the sending school. Schools should be informed as to what kinds of discrepancies exist and how frequently. Use of instructional guidelines will be encouraged.

Checkpoint process:

- ☐ After scorers have validated 5 samples each, stop process to do a check to determine consistency or inter rater reliability and record issues.

Step 3:

- ☐ If a school establishes a validation rate of 85% or higher (100 or more tasks) on a designated task, THEN the school may calibrate and score the rest of their samples for that task on their own under the direction of the task specialist and send a random 50% of the 3's to Skills for validation (and any 2's that may be questionable 3's).